DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 060 UD 026 290

AUTHOR	Bullock, Charles S., III
TITLE	The Impact of Southern School Desegregation: Interracial Contact and Student Prejudice.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	8 Nov 75
GRANT	NIE-G-00-3-0182
NOTE	58p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association (Nashville, TN, November 6-8, 1975).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Age Differences; *Black Students; Desegregation Effects; High Schools; *High School Students; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Differences; Racial Integration; *Racial Relations; Religious Differences; Rural Urban Differences; *School Desegregation; Sex Differences; Social Integration; Student Attitudes; *White Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Georgia

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the racial attitudes of 5,770 black and white Georgia high school students, comparing the attitudes of students in desegregated and segregated schools. It was found that generally positive racial attitudes exist among all groups of students. On all but one question used in the racial attitudes scale at least 60 percent of the students gave tolerant responses; on seven of eight questions, fewer than 14 percent gave responses indicating prejudice. In light of the Georgia tradition of white supremacy it was surprising to find segregated whites much more tolerant than desegregated ones; these apparently stem from a general improvement in racial attitudes that may be occurring throughout the South. Findings of this report support the following general conclusions: (1) white females are more tolerant than white males; (2) whites with white collar fathers are more tolerant; (3) whites with good grades are more tolerant; (4) for both blacks and whites, students in desegregated urban schools are more tolerant than students attending rural schools; and (5) blacks are generally more tolerant than whites. In desegregated schools, younger students are significantly less tolerant than older ones. White intolerance did not increase in schools with higher proportions of blacks. Interracial contact and cross-racial friendships were found to be the strongest correlates of racial tolerance. Data are presented on 11 tables. A six-page list of references is included. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

7-7-88
H2

ED297060

THE IMPACT OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: INTERRACIAL CONTACT AND STUDENT PREJUDICE*

Charles S. Bullock, III

University of Houston

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

*This research was made possible by a grant (Grant No. NE-G-00-3-0182) from the National Institute of Education. I am particularly grateful to Mary Braxton and Joe Stewart who have spent more hours than they care to recall helping to collect, code, and analyze the data.

Presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, November 6-8, 1975.

UD026290

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE IMPACT OF SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: INTERRACIAL CONTACT AND STUDENT PREJUDICE

It has been widely assumed that when black and white children attend school together, their racial attitudes will change. Proponents of desegregation have hoped that observing members of the other race in the classroom, interacting on the playground, and participating in social activities will undercut racial stereotypes. Interpersonal contact was expected to point up contradictions in the generalizations which students applied to members of the other race. The anticipated end result was an increase in racial tolerance. Segregationists also acknowledged that interracial contact would diminish prejudice. Thus they warned that school desegregation would ultimately lead to transgressing the taboo against miscegenation.

Many southern whites had such negative views of blacks that if any change of attitude occurred, it would have to be in the direction of moderation. Most southern whites' contact with blacks had been limited to some form of superior-subordinate relationship. Behavior of blacks in menial roles where they deferred to whites conformed with the generally accepted myth of white superiority. First-hand experiences in school with blacks who were good students or who assumed positions of leadership would challenge the stereotypes. Some whites would treat such observations as exceptional cases but others would go a step further and begin to re-evalute the accuracy of their general perceptions.

This process would lead, at the least, to modifications in racial attitudes.

Reduction of racial hostility, to the extent that it occurred, was expected to result from biracial contact. Attending an officially desegregated school, but in which one attended classes only with members of his or her race, participated only in extracurricular activities with students of the same race, and rode a school bus all of whose passengers were the same race, would probably do little to challenge existing stereotypes. Such extreme racial isolation was not uncommon during the early days of desegregation. Even now use of ability grouping produces some one-race classes and residential patterns produce some one-race bus routes. Some extracurricular activities in some schools attract participants from only one race (Gottlieb and Ten Houten, 1965:204-212). Therefore more critical than school desegregation in determining racial attitudes is inter-racial contact within the schools and at school functions.

This paper investigates the racial attitudes of several thousand southern black and white high school students. It first compares attitudes of students in desegregated and segregated schools. Next the racial attitudes of students in desegregated schools will be analyzed, controlling for the amount of interracial contact which they report. In investigating racial attitudes, a number of personal (e.g. sex, age, academic achievement) and systemic characteristics (e.g. percent black in the school) will be considered.

Sample

The data analyzed consist of responses to a paper and pencil survey administered to 5,770 students in Georgia schools. Of those surveyed 58 percent were white and 42 percent were black; 36 percent were eighth graders, 37 percent were sophomores, and 27 percent were seniors. Half of the sample (49.6 percent) attended schools in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas and will be referred to as the urban segment of the study. Males and females were evenly represented in the sample. The data were collected during 1974 and early 1975 in 28 schools. Five of the schools were private, the others were public.

In terms of racial composition, the entire range was covered in this cross-sectional study. In both the urban and rural subsets an all-black and an all-white school were surveyed. Also two of the private schools were all-white academies (one urban and one rural) which educated the children of whites unwilling to accept desegregated schools. Schools were also selected which were 8-20 percent black, 40-50 percent black, 51-60 percent black, 61-70 percent black, and 71-80 percent black.

In rural schools an attempt was made to survey all eighth, tenth, and twelfth graders. Because of the much larger enrollments in urban schools, we sought to survey between 100 and 200 in each class.

Dependent Variable

The measurement of racial attitudes was done using eight questions developed by Herbert M. Greenberg (1961:106-108).

These questions tap the racial tolerance of respondents in several contexts. Students were asked how they felt about interacting with classmates of the other race in several environments, for example, cafeteria, school bus, and classrooms. Other questions focused on students' levels of prejudice. (The wording of the questions used is presented in Table 1.) Responses to the questions were made using a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with undecided at the mid-point.

Factor analysis was used to determine that all eight questions were tapping the same dimension. As shown in Table 1, the loadings are all fairly strong having absolute values between .449 and .712. Inspection of responses to the individual questions reveals that the bulk of the respondents were positive toward members of the other race on all but one item in the scale. Except for the question about perceived superiority of the respondent's race, between 64.5 and 86.0 percent of the respondents indicated racial tolerance in their answers. All but 14 percent of the students supported school bus desegregation and 80.5 percent expressed willingness to have teachers of the opposite race. An absence of racial bias was less often shown on questions about whether racial prejudice was rational and whether members of the other race introduced dirty play into athletic contests. On these items, 64.5 and 64.9 percent, respectively, answered in an unprejudiced fashion.

(Table 1 goes here)

The one question on which fewer than a majority of the students rejected responses indicating prejudice was the one asking whether one's own race was superior. A slight plurality (42.1 percent) agreed with this statement while 37.3 percent rejected the notion of superiority. The more frequent support for belief in racial superiority is probably due not simply to traditional feelings by southern whites but also to the racial pride which has developed among many blacks in recent years.

Having determined that the eight questions tap a single dimension for racial attitudes, a scale was developed by adding the standardized z scores for each respondent on the eight questions. Responses to three questions were recoded so that a code of 1 would indicate a very tolerant response and a code of 5 would be a very prejudiced response. The dependent variable for each respondent is the summed z score.

Independent Variables

Eight characteristics were selected as independent variables. The following discussion will describe the findings of other researchers who have used these variables in studying racial attitudes. From the literature review, hypotheses stating the anticipated relationships between the independent and dependent variables will be derived. Frequently, however, different studies have come to opposite conclusions concerning the effect of an individual variable.

Sex. A number of studies have found sex of the respondent to be associated with racial attitudes; however, there is no consistency

on whether males or females are more accepting of members of the other race. A study of seven newly desegregated, predominantly white Missouri districts concluded that boys adjusted more readily than girls (Dwyer, 1958:254). Gottlieb and Ten Houten's research (1965:210) in three high schools in a large midwestern city found that in both races males more often named members of the other race among their friends than did females. Noel and Pinckney (1964:613-614) found that female adults of both races were more prejudiced than males.

Other scholars have reached the opposite conclusion, i.e. that females display less prejudice than males. A study of elementary school children in a northern city found that girls showed less rejection of other races on a Bogardus Social Distance scale than did boys (Dentler and Elkins, 1967:67). A replication of a 1955 survey of racial attitudes among white University of Texas students found that by 1958 coeds had become more tolerant while males had become somewhat less tolerant (Young et al., 1960:132). Useem's research (1972:8) on white high school sophomores concluded that males demonstrated greater racial hostility than did females.

Some research on blacks reports that females adapt less easily to desegregation than do males. Following desegregation, black females are more likely to withdraw unto themselves than are black males (Campbell and Yarrow, 1958:29-46; Criswell, 1937:81-89; Gordon, 1967). Silverman and Shaw (1973:136-140) found somewhat similar results in their longitudinal study of a desegregated junior high and high school in Gainesville, Florida. Although

differences were not statistically significant, white females and black males tended to be more positive about desegregation than were white males and black females. Similar results are reported for suburban Boston schools to which inner-city blacks were bused (Armor, 1973:108).

Findings that black females often react negatively to desegregation are usually attributed to fear that black males will be attracted to white females since white standards for beauty are widely accepted by both races. Failure to adjust to desegregation among white males is often attributed to jealousy over black physical prowess.

Finally several studies have not found race to be significantly related to racial attitudes. In this group is Lombardi's study (1963:136) of a newly desegregated Maryland school. Bartel et al.'s study (1973:164) of primary children found that differences in sex had only negligible effect. Research by Shaw (1973: 145) using Florida elementary students and by Fiddmont and Levine (1969:129) using black high school students in Kansas City, Missouri, also found that boys and girls had similar racial attitudes.

Race. Research has generally found that whites express less preference for interaction with blacks than blacks do for interaction with whites. In a study of two senior classes in Huntington, West Virginia, Mastroianni and Khatena (1972:224) found that 96 percent of the whites wanted their close friends to be of their

race but only 14 percent of the blacks wanted close friends to be of their race. Among children in kindergarten through the fourth grade, Bartel et al. (1973:165) report that although children of both races tended to display negative attitudes toward blacks, this proclivity was more pronounced among whites. Research on first and second graders in an eastern city reported that white children showed a preference for white teachers and friends while black children indicated equal acceptance of both races (Koslin et al., 1969:383).

Noel and Pinkney's analysis (1964:610) of data collected between 1948 and 1952 for the Cornell study of intergroup relations found that only five percent of the whites gave no responses indicating prejudice against blacks while 48 percent of the whites rejected all types of contact with blacks. Among the black portion of the four-city sample, 41 percent revealed no prejudice toward whites and only 17 percent rejected all forms of interracial contact. A more recent analysis of a national adult sample classified 33 percent of the whites but only five percent of the blacks as being highly prejudiced (Geyer, 1973:29). Among college students Provenza and Strickland (1965:277) found that black responses were more favorable toward whites on a sematic differential scale than were whites' evaluations of blacks.

Longitudinal studies of the consequences of desegregation on racial attitudes report that the impact varies by race. A study of three sets of sophomores in South Carolina found that black tolerance of whites increased after desegregation but whites became more hostile (McWhirt, 1967). Although the Silverman and

Shaw (1973:137-140) study of Gainesville, Florida, students found no significant differences between blacks and whites' attitudes toward the opposite race, they did see a trend. At the time of their first survey, blacks were more prejudiced than whites but two months later the pattern had reversed.

Socioeconomic status. Research is almost unanimous in finding that lower status whites are less tolerant of blacks than are higher status whites. Tumin's (1958) study of the attitudes toward desegregation among white males in Guilford County, North Carolina, found hard core racists much less common among those who had white collar jobs. Tumin concluded that, "The higher the income, the more ready for desegregation without exception" (1958:260). Other surveys of adults support the conclusion that lower status whites are more prejudiced than higher status whites (Geyer, 1973:30-31; Noel and Pinkney, 1964:611).

Using aggregate data, Matthews and Prothro (1966:343) and Bullock and Rodgers (1974) have found that school desegregation has been implemented more readily where family income is relatively high. The greater prejudice among poor whites is probably caused by their feeling more threatened by desegregation (St. John, 1972: 11). Low status whites may have little with which to differentiate themselves from blacks other than the rights and privileges accorded their race but denied blacks. School desegregation and other changes which undermine the myth of white superiority might leave lower status whites on a par with blacks. Thus lower income whites are more likely to experience a sense of relative

deprivation when blacks' conditions improve.

Studies of students' racial attitudes typically support the general finding that high socioeconomic status is associated with lower racial prejudice. Useem's (1972:10) paper on northern suburban whites in schools having token black enrollments reports that whites whose fathers have blue-collar jobs are less tolerant than are the children of white collar fathers. Research on preschoolers in Boston (Porter, 1971) also finds that higher status white children show less prejudice. Third through sixth graders also showed less evidence of anti-black stereotyping among higher status whites (Dentler and Elkins, 1967:71).

On the basis of an extensive literature review Ehrlich (1973: 78) concludes that people of high status less often voice negative racial stereotypes and more often embrace positive stereotypes than do low status people. He tempers this observation however: "To assert, then, that increases in socioeconomic status have any major effect on levels of prejudice is a serious overstatement" (p. 78).

Three studies have not found high socioeconomic status to be related to racial tolerance. Lombardi's (1963:132) study of a Maryland high school with a token black enrollment found that higher status whites were no more likely to form more positive attitudes toward blacks following desegregation than were lower status whites. Armor (1972:108) reports an absence of statistically significant differences in racial attitudes between blue-collar and white-collar black children in Boston. Standing alone is a

study of University of Texas college students which discovered that parental income was inversely related to racial tolerance (Young et al., 1960:133).

Academic Achievement. Students who excel in school generally display greater racial tolerance than do poorer students (St. John, 1972:11). This finding emerges for a wide age range of students. Dentler and Elkins (1967:61-77) report that among youngsters in grades three through six in a northern city, IQ and reading ability were weakly, albeit statistically significantly, associated with racial tolerance. In her study of white high school sophomores, Useem (1972:13) had access to school records on achievement. She found a statistically significant relationship between ability and racial tolerance which persisted even after controlling for socioeconomic status. In a small sample of fifth graders in the New York City suburbs, Singer (1967:111-115) discovered that high IQ whites in unsegregated schools had more favorable attitudes than did pupils with low IQ's. No differences were evident in the segregated school, leading Singer to speculate that, "Where there is contact with Negroes, IQ plays the role of a 'sensitizer' and so, generally speaking, the higher the IQ, the more differentiated the response" (p. 111). In a second test of racial tolerance, using the same students, IQ was not related to racial stereotyping in either the segregated or desegregated school.

The Young et al. (1960:132) study of college students also found that academic performance was associated with racial tolerance.

Students with grade point averages of A or B were more tolerant than those with lower grades.

Ehrlich (1972:139) suggests that "high levels of intellectual ability retard the acquisition of ethnic prejudice." Perhaps poor students, like lower status people, feel more threatened by blacks. In a desegregated school whites who do poorly may use blacks as scapegoats, ascribing their own lack of success to the special treatment which they believe teachers accord black pupils.

One piece of research goes against the stream. In a study of San Francisco area fifth graders a measure of achievement was constructed by averaging students' reading and mathematics achievement scores. Among lower class children in all white schools, Tabachnick (1962:200-201) finds no correlation between achievement and prejudice.

Urbanization. Because research on students' racial attitudes has typically been limited to single communities or to schools in a single metropolitan area, there is little cross-sectional data on the relative degree of prejudice shown by children in rural areas and in urban centers. There are, however, studies using older subjects which use the size of the community from which the respondent comes or in which he lives as an independent variable.

Generally it has been found that people from smaller communities display greater prejudice than do people from metropolitan areas. The study of University of Texas students (Young et al., 1960:132) reported that students from cities with at least 50,000 residents were more tolerant than were their peers from less popu-

lous areas. Tumin's (1958:260) analysis of racial attitudes of white males in one North Carolina county found a larger proportion of hard core racists among the rural component of his sample.

An analysis of a national survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (Geyer, 1973:35) also uncovered an urban-rural difference. In this 1972 sample, rural adults were more prejudiced than were urban ones. When Geyer controlled for the amount of education of the respondents, the relationship between size of hometown and prejudice persisted for people with less than a high school education. Among the better educated, the urban-rural difference disappeared.

Religion. Studies which have used religion as an independent variable have not found it to be related to prejudice. Tumin (1958) reports that in Guilford, North Carolina, "we find that religious affiliation is thoroughly non-discriminating. None of the groups [groups defined on the basis of scores on a prejudice scale] differs significantly from any other in its percentages of Baptists or of Methodists (the two most numerous)" (p. 259). Looking only at Protestant groups, Lombardi (1963) finds no significant differences in racial attitude change when religion is used in his study of high school students. Nor does Useem (1972:9) find religious preference to be a useful discriminating variable for northern white tenth graders. Useem, however, does not distinguish by types of Protestant belief, breaking her sample down only into Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, and other.

The size of the sample in the present research will permit investigation of the racial attitudes of a greater number of religious groups than others have examined. More precise differentiation may lead to evidence that religious affiliation does make a difference.

Age. Because attitudes tend to harden and become more negative with age, it is usually recommended that desegregation begin with the very young (St. John, 1975). Thus a frequent finding is that white racial hostility becomes increasingly frequent among older students (Campbell and Yarrow, 1958:29-46). For example, Radke and Sutherland (1949) found that among seventh and eighth graders the ratio of mentions of negative to positive stereotypes concerning blacks was one to five. Among ninth and tenth graders the ratio dropped to one in four and among junior and seniors fully one-third of the racial stereotypes were critical of blacks.

The research by Bartel et al. (1973) on younger children--kindergarten through fourth grade--found the same pattern of declining racial tolerance among older students. "Thus, regarding positive social questions [i.e. questions asking students who they would like to play on a team with], these children revealed an almost total racial polarization by the fourth grade, with black children nominating almost only black children and white children nominating almost only white children" (p. 171).

A study of fourth through sixth graders found that there was more contact across racial lines among younger students (Shaw, 1973:153). Younger blacks were also somewhat more likely to express

preferences for whites as classmates than were older blacks. Armor (1972:109) found that younger students supported a Boston busing program to achieve desegregation more than did older students. He also reports data from Riverdale, California, showing that as students mature, they make fewer cross-racial friendship choices. The patterning of white preferences for and against blacks as fellow classmates was, however, not monotonically associated with age.

Dwyer's (1958:253) study of seven rural Missouri districts reports findings suggesting that prejudice may not increase beyond elementary school. Thus in his survey, elementary students accepted desegregation more readily than did older students. However, there was no difference in the attitudes of respondents aged 13 through 18.

Research on students in grades seven through twelve also fails to find prejudice increasing with age (Silverman and Shaw, 1973:138). In this sample of Gainesville, Florida, students, prejudice increased among whites from grades seven through nine then dropped continuously during the remaining years. The pattern for blacks was more complex, peaking at grade eight, dropping the next year, rising again in grade ten, and then declining during the next two years.

Work by Dentler and Elkins (1967:65) found that sixth graders were more willing than third graders to accept blacks as neighbors, club members, best friends, and dinner guests. In summary, the relationship between age and prejudice varies among studies.

Proportion black. Numerous studies have found that whites display less prejudice and are more willing to tolerate the acquisition of equal rights by blacks when the black population is relatively small (Matthews and Prothro, 1964 and 1966; Dye, 1968:141-165; Stephen, 1955:133-135; Bullock and Rodgers, 1974). These findings suggest that white students might display less prejudice in schools having small black enrollments.

Research on the size of the black enrollment in a desegregated school suggests that black adaptation to desegregation does not increase monotonically as percent black in the school rises. On the basis of research on students in grades three through six, Koslin et al. (n.d.:9-10) conclude that 15 percent black is an important threshold. Black males in classes less than 15 percent black displayed greater social distance from whites and less preference for desegregated schools than did blacks in classes with larger black components. Increasing the proportion black beyond 15 percent, however, neither made black attitudes toward whites more positive nor was it associated with heightened white racial hostility.

A study of black juniors and seniors in a New England school district explored the impact of attending elementary and junior high schools having various racial compositions on the frequency with which blacks selected whites for four types of interaction (St. John, 1964:339). The author found that although blacks who had more experience going to school with whites were somewhat more likely to choose whites as fellow participants, the frequency was

not statistically significant. Further investigation showed that blacks who had gone to schools with more whites differed from other blacks only in the frequency with which they named whites as lunch companions. No differences existed in the frequency with which whites were named as leaders, work partners, or weekend companions.

Interracial Contact

Proponents of desegregation have hoped that when black and white students interact, they will learn more about members of the other race, and this knowledge will lead to more positive attitudes about the other race. These notions, which are comparable to those underlying cultural exchange programs, assume that as people learn about different ethnic or racial groups, they come to evaluate them as individuals rather than simply applying stereotypic images.

While noting that interracial contact may have positive consequences in terms of correcting stereotypic thinking and promoting racial tolerance, theorists are quick to point out that not all contact will reduce racial or ethnic hostility. Thomas Pettigrew (1971) observes that

> Increasing interaction, whether of groups or individuals, intensifies and magnifies processes already underway. Hence, more interracial contact can lead either to greater prejudice and rejection or to greater respect and acceptance, depending upon the situation in which it occurs (p. 275).

Gordon Allport (1958:267) postulated four conditions which enhance the likelihood that interracial contact will reduce prejudice. If black and white children are to emerge from desegregated classrooms displaying less bias, it is important that the two races be of approximately equal status. Racial hostility should be ameliorated if the races are mutually interdependent and if they seek common goals. Conversely, if blacks and whites are thrown into a competitive situation, underlying racial antagonisms may be brought to the fore. Finally, contact across racial lines is more likely to promote understanding if the contact is supported by the authorities. Thus school desegregation is more likely to lead to greater black-white understanding if school officials show that they approve of the process and try to carry it off smoothly.

The research conducted here, like many other studies of the effects of desegregation, cannot determine with precision whether any or all of the conditions associated with positive attitude change existed in the schools surveyed. Therefore it is impossible to know whether to expect that behavioral differences of school officials in their treatment of black and white students may have caused variations in student racial attitudes. Within schools, however, there are conditions, the presence or absence of which can be determined, and which may therefore help account for differences in racial attitudes.

Investigations of white attitudes toward blacks report that whites who have interacted with blacks are less racially intoler-

ant. White attitudes favorable toward blacks and a greater willingness to interact with blacks have been found among whites who served in the armed forces with blacks (Stouffer, 1949:Chapter 10), sailed in the merchant marine with blacks (Brophy, 1945:456-466), and lived near blacks in public housing projects (Jahoda and West, 1951:132-139; Deutsch and Collins, 1951; Wilner, Walkley, and Cook, 1955:95; Works, 1961:47-52).

There have also been a number of studies which have found that whites who went to school with blacks are less likely to express hostility toward blacks. For example, whites who attended desegregated schools displayed greater willingness to live in desegregated neighborhoods, have their children attend desegregated schools, and to have black friends than did whites who had attended segregated schools (Racial Isolation, 1967:112). Both black and white primary school youngsters in an eastern desegregated school showed greater willingness to interact with children of the other race than did youngsters in segregated schools (Koslin et al., 1969:383).

Although some research has found that simply attending desegregated schools contributes to more positive white attitudes, others indicate that more extensive contact is necessary. An early study of southern desegregation noted that although whites who had frequent classes with blacks were not more tolerant, whites who reported having black friends were less prejudiced than were whites without black friends (Campbell, 1958:338-339). White adults with black friends also show less prejudice (Noel and Pinkney, 1964:617).

Surveys done before and after desegregation of a San Francisco Bay area junior high school reported that whites who experienced desegregation were significantly less accepting of blacks than were whites who remained at an all-white school (Webster, 1961:292-296). Indeed whites in the desegregated school became more prejudiced after desegregation. However students in the desegregated school who reported cross-race friendships did display significantly greater social acceptance of the other race. Blacks became more accepting of whites during the desegregated experience.

A study of elementary children in a northern city found that whites attending desegregated schools displayed less acceptance of blacks on a Bogardus social distance scale than did whites in segregated schools (Dentler and Elkins, 1967:71). This study did not compare racial attitudes after controlling for the presence or absence of black friends. The authors suggest that the whites in desegregated schools may have been more hostile toward blacks because these schools served a transitional neighborhood which was rapidly changing from white to black.

In two small samples of white fifth graders in a New York City suburb, those in a desegregated school displayed less social distance between themselves and blacks than did segregated whites (Singer, 1967:103). There were no significant differences, however, between the segregated and desegregated in terms of racial attitudes or cultural stereotypes. Data on a segregated and a desegregated sample of black youngsters, also reported by Singer, found that the former showed less social distance from other groups than did the latter (pp. 107-108).

Another study which surveyed fifth graders revealed that there was a decline in white stereotypes of blacks as being different and inferior (Chesler et al., 1968:4). However, the authors concluded that, "With few exceptions the white youngsters ended the school year with the same attitudes toward Negroes that they had at the beginning" (p. 4).

Lombardi's (1959:129-136) re-test of white Maryland high school students who had completed six months in a high school with 15 blacks found no significant attitude changes. Even after controlling for contact with the black students, there was no indication that desegregation led to more positive white racial attitudes.

More recent research on a set of white, Boston suburban sophomores found that students who had attended classes with blacks were more negative about the busing program which brought blacks to their schools than were whites who had not had contact with blacks (Useem, 1972:15). This relationship, however, disappeared in a multiple regression analysis. While classroom contact seemingly had little impact on racial attitudes, there was a slight indication that interracial contact in school activities did lead to more positive attitudes.

A longitudinal study of black Bostonians found that after two years of desegregation the desegregated students favored non-white schools more than did the control group which had remained segregated (Armor, 1972:102-103). The desegregated blacks also scored higher on a scale to measure support for racial separation.

In the research to be reported in this paper, amount of interracial contact was measured using seven questions which asked

how much contact the respondent had with members of the other race in the following contexts: classrooms, school bus, athletics, cafeteria, school dances and parties, musical activities (e.g. band and chorus) and school clubs or organizations. When the responses were factor analyzed, a single dimension emerged, as shown in Table 2.

(Table 2 goes here)

Hypotheses

The literature review indicates a substantial amount of conflict over the consequences of school desegregation for racial attitudes. For example, studies can be cited which show that students who have attended desegregated schools display less racial prejudice than do those who have gone to one-race schools. Other researchers have found that the desegregated pupils are more prejudiced and still other scholars have found an absence of differences. Similar variation exists for several of the other variables which have been discussed.

Because of the inconsistencies in the results reported by others, the hypotheses to be tested are often stated in their null form. If the literature has been fairly consistent in finding results in a single direction, then the hypothesis to be tested will specify direction.

H1: There will be no difference in the racial attitudes of segregated and desegregated students.

H2: Blacks will have more positive interracial attitudes than whites.

H3: There are no significant differences in the racial attitudes of males and females.

If, however, we control for race, the literature suggests that sexual differences may emerge.

H3A: Among blacks, males will display more positive racial attitudes than females.

H3B: Among whites, females will display more positive racial attitudes than males.

H4: Lower status whites will be more prejudiced than higher status whites.

H5: Students who do well in school will be more racially tolerant than will students who do poorly.

H6: Urban students will be less prejudiced than will rural students.

H7: There will be no significant differences between students of different religions.

H8: Among junior high and high school students, racial tolerance will not be associated with age.

H9A: The higher the proportion black in the school, the more negative will be white racial attitudes.

H9B: Black attitudes toward whites will not be related to the proportion white in the school.

H10: Controlling for the amount of interracial contact will not alter the bivariate relationships.

Desegregation and Racial Attitudes

In this section the mean values on the racial attitudes scale are compared for students in segregated and desegregated schools. Segregated schools are those in which at least 99 percent of the students are of one race. All other schools are desegregated and have between eight and 80 percent black enrollments. After controlling for the presence of desegregation, racial attitudes of a number of types of students were inspected.

In evaluating hypotheses, t tests were computed on the means. A probability of .05 is set for determining the significance of the differences in means. The hypotheses indicate whether a one or two-tail test of significance is appropriate. One-tail tests were used when hypothesis specified an anticipated difference between groups.

Desegregation. Data reported in Table 3 show that hypothesis 1 must be rejected. Students in segregated schools were significantly less prejudiced than were those in desegregated schools. The next step is to control for race to determine whether the differences in the segregated and desegregated students are attributable to the attitudes of one race or the other. The differences in the attitudes of whites parallel those for the entire sample. Whites attending desegregated schools were substantially less tolerant than were students in all-white schools. In the black sample, students in desegregated schools were somewhat more tolerant than were students in all-black schools, but the differences are not statistically significant.

(Table 3 goes here)

Race. Evidence appropriate for testing hypothesis 2 is also presented in Table 3. As hypothesized, among desegregated students, blacks were more tolerant than whites. However, in the segregated sample whites were much more tolerant than blacks. Surprisingly, segregated whites proved to be the most tolerant group of the four.

Sex. Hypothesis 3 predicts no differences in the racial attitudes of males and females. Data presented in Table 4 show that this hypothesis must be rejected since in both the segregated and desegregated schools females displayed greater racial tolerance than males. Hypothesis 3A is also not supported by the data. Contrary to expectations black males were not significantly less prejudiced than females.

(Table 4 goes here)

The expected pattern was found, however, for whites. As postulated in hypothesis 3B, white females were much more tolerant than males. This finding held for both segregated and desegregated students.

Socioeconomic status. Two measures of socioeconomic status are used. The first is the family social status as perceived by the respondent. The options were upper, middle, working, and lower class. As shown in Table 5, prejudice does not increase consistently as we go from upper to lower class whites. For both segregated and desegregated whites the most tolerant responses came

from middle class students. In the desegregated sample, the least tolerant whites were ones who believed that their family was upper class. The mean for lower class whites was the same as for working class whites. Among segregated students, lower class respondents were the most prejudiced, as had been expected, but the results are somewhat suspect because of the small number of observations. In sum, hypothesis 4 is not supported by these data.

(Table 5 goes here)

The relationship between status and racial attitudes among blacks has rarely been studied and therefore no direction was hypothesized for those respondents. Inspection of the data does not lead to a generalization appropriate for both segregated and desegregated blacks. Among segregated blacks there is an indication that perceived status and tolerance are inversely related. In the desegregated set, tolerance increases as we move from upper to working class, but the lower class students were less tolerant than those of the middle and working classes. The small numbers of students who designated their families as being upper or lower class dictates a cautious interpretation of the results.

The second measure used for socioeconomic status is the occupation of the respondent's father. Responses were coded into the categories used by the United States Bureau of the Census. Data in Table 6 show some support for hypothesis 4. Among the segregated and the desegregated the means on the racial attitude scale were

higher for the children of white collar workers than for others. Upon closer inspection we find, however, that within the white collar ranks, the relationships are not monotonic. Thus for neither set of whites is the progression from most to least tolerant in this order: children of professionals, managers, clerical, sales. Among blue collar occupations, a monotonic relationship between status and tolerance emerged among segregated but not among de-segregated students.

(Table 6 goes here)

Among blacks there is not even a consistent pattern for children of white and blue collar fathers. Among those in all-black schools, the mean on the racial attitude scale for children of white collar workers tended to lie close to the mean for all black children in segregated schools.

Academic Achievement. The hypothesis that academic achievement would be positively related to racial tolerance is borne out for whites but not blacks. In Table 7 are data showing that for both sets of whites students with A averages were the most tolerant while those with averages of D or F were the least tolerant of blacks. Although differences between the attitudes of grade groups were not always statistically significant, the pattern is quite clear and in the expected direction. No pattern emerged among black pupils.

(Table 7 goes here)

Urbanization. Results generally support hypothesis 6 which stated that urban students would be less prejudiced than rural students. Greater racial tolerance among urban students was found in both the segregated and desegregated samples and for whites within each sample. (See Table 8.) Urban blacks in desegregated schools also demonstrated greater racial tolerance than did their rural peers. Only among segregated blacks were urban students less tolerant than rural ones.

(Table 8 goes here)

Religion. Unlike in other studies, religious preference was associated with racial tolerance in the Georgia schools. As data in Table 9 indicate, among whites, Baptists and members of Pentecostal churches tended to have the lowest scores on the racial tolerance scale. They are followed by Methodists and other Protestants in that order. Catholics and Jews were the most tolerant although the order of these groups is not the same for segregated and desegregated pupils.

(Table 9 goes here)

For both sets of blacks, Catholics indicated the greatest evidence of tolerance and were followed by Methodists. Baptists and other Protestants generally displayed less tolerance of whites. For blacks as well as whites, the differences between the racial attitudes of members of some faiths were not statistically significant. However, in all but one instance the differences be-

tween groups at the extremes were significant. (This excludes groups having very small n's, for example Jews.)

Age. The null hypothesis that racial tolerance will not vary with age must be rejected for desegregated students. Results reported in Table 10 show that in desegregated schools seniors were significantly more tolerant than eighth graders, with sophomores falling between the two groups, albeit somewhat closer to the seniors. Quite different results were found in the segregated schools. In these schools, for both races, the youngest and oldest students had very similar attitudes. Among blacks, however, sophomores were somewhat less tolerant than were the others while among whites sophomores were somewhat more tolerant.

(Table 10 goes here)

Proportion black. Figures in Table 11 do not support the hypothesis that whites are more hostile toward blacks in schools having larger proportions of black students. Contrary to hypothesis 9A, the mean scores on the racial attitude scale are almost identical for whites in schools having between eight and 50 and between 61 and 80 percent black enrollments. The most tolerant group was whites in all-white schools while the least tolerant attended schools in which blacks comprised a small majority. Least tolerance among whites in schools which are 51 to 60 percent black may result from jealousy produced by a small black majority consistently winning elections and other decisions decided by balloting. Such jealousy might not arise in schools having larger black enrollments because whites

in these schools may have little expectation of controlling elections.

(Table 11 goes here)

Data on blacks generally support the hypothesis that black racial attitudes are not a product of the proportion white in the school. Respondents in all-black schools were among the least tolerant but in no instance were differences statistically significant.

Interracial Contact and Racial Attitudes

In the previous section we saw, among other things, that whites in desegregated schools were less tolerant than were students in all-white schools. In this section, relationships between independent variables and racial attitudes will be inspected after controlling for the amount of interracial contact. Two measures of the amount of biracial contact will be used. The first is a scale developed using the z scores for the seven facets of interracial contact listed in Table 2. The second measure is the proportion of friends which the respondent had who were of the same race as he/she. The null hypothesis is that controlling for the amount of interracial contact or the presence of cross-racial friendships will not affect the relationships between other variables and tolerance.

Interracial Contact

The correlation between scores on the interracial contact scale and on the racial tolerance scale was Pearson r = .25. This

was significant at the .001 level and indicated that students who scored higher on the racial contact scale expressed more tolerant attitudes about the other race. Indeed this is the largest correlation to be found in the paper. However, controlling for the amount of racial contact did not alter the initial bivariate relationships observed between the independent variables already examined and racial attitudes. Thus hypothesis 10 which postulated that the amount of racial contact would not alter bivariate relationship is confirmed.

Although beyond the scope of this preliminary analysis, it is possible that some types of contact do affect the relationships between characteristics of individuals or the school environment and racial tolerance. Exploration of the unique influence of each of the seven types of contact which were used to form the scale might indicate that different types of contact impact differently on racial attitudes or on independent predictors of attitudes.

Cross-Racial Friendship

Students with friends who were members of the other race were more tolerant. The correlation coefficient of .22 is significant at the .001 level. Although an r of this size is larger than any of those computed between other variables except for interracial contact, controlling for cross-racial friendships did not appreciably change any of the bivariate relationships.

Nonetheless when the friendship variable was dichotomized at its mean, consistently significant differences were found. Without exception students who had more than the average proportion of friends in the other race were more tolerant than were students having a larger percentage of friends who were of their own race. This pattern existed for blacks and whites and emerged for each of the personal background and environmental variables analyzed earlier. Since the mean proportion of close friendships outside of one's own race is only 15 percent, apparently even a few friends in the other race makes a significant impact on racial attitudes. The friendship variable, however, while important, does not supersede the influence of other variables, some of which seemingly have an independent effect on tolerance.

Summary and Implications

In an area in which there is so much confusion over the direction of research findings, the results of yet another study cannot resolve the conflicts. The present study does, however, shed light on racial attitudes in a region in which they have been studied relatively little. This paper differs from most of the earlier research in several important ways. It has a far larger sample of respondents, it taps attitudes in a larger number of schools, it deals with a greater variety of schools, and it focuses on schools which were quite reluctant to desegregate and where racial prejudice has been common. For these reasons the findings presented here deserve serious consideration.

Perhaps the most important finding is that generally positive racial attitudes exist among all groups of students. On all but one question used in the racial attitude scale at least 60 percent of the students gave tolerant responses. Or, from another perspective, on seven of eight questions, fewer than 14 percent gave responses indicating prejudice. It is inconceivable that such widespread acceptance of the other race would have been registered even in the recent past. These data suggest much greater racial acceptance than the history of race relations in Georgia might have led one to anticipate.

Since most respondents gave racially tolerant responses, comparisons between groups to some extent deal simply with differences in the relative degree of tolerance. Since the means on seven of eight questions were toward the tolerant end of the

five-point scale, some responses which were less tolerant than the average were not actually prejudiced. For example, the mean for the question asking whether blacks and whites should be segregated in the cafeteria was 1.70 indicating a position on the scale between strong agreement and agreement with the tolerant position. Since agreement would be coded 2, it would lie to the right, or intolerant, side of the mean.

In light of the tradition of white superiority, it was surprising to find segregated whites much more tolerant than desegregated ones. The more positive attitudes registered by segregated whites were not produced by desegregation but apparently stem from a general improvement in racial attitudes which we suspect is occurring throughout the South. It remains to be determined whether the less tolerant attitudes of desegregated whites were caused by negative experiences with black classmates. Indeed an absence of the conditions which Allport (1958:267) postulated to be prerequisites for improving racial attitudes no doubt characterizes many of the desegregated schools in this sample. It may be, therefore, that the racial attitudes observed for desegregated whites are quite positive in light of the school environment.

In testing other hypotheses, the results for the Georgia sample support several of them. Findings of this paper support the general conclusions that (1) white females are more tolerant than white males; (2) whites with white collar fathers are more tolerant; and (3) whites with good grades are more tolerant. For both blacks and whites, students in desegregated urban schools were

more tolerant than pupils attending rural schools. Also, blacks were generally more tolerant than whites.

For two hypotheses the Georgia results run counter the direction observed in other studies. Particularly striking is the finding that in desegregated schools younger students are significantly less tolerant than the older ones. A possible explanation for this is that with maturity comes the ability to critically evaluate the frequently negative racial attitudes which many whites acquired at home. It is less likely in the South than elsewhere that white youngsters come to school free of racial bias. Therefore, unlike in some northern research settings where children acquire prejudice with age, in the Georgia sample maturation is apparently accompanied by the shedding of some negative images.

Also surprising was the finding that white intolerance did not increase as we moved to schools having higher proportions of blacks. From Table 11 we suggest that the racial mix of a desegregated school has little effect on student attitudes. Only among whites in schools 51 to 60 percent black and blacks in schools 61 to 70 percent black is there any indication of appreciably less tolerance. This finding indicates great latitude on the attitudinal dimension for administrators in setting racial proportions.

On one hypothesis evidence presented here shows the existence of differences where none had been predicted. The Georgia sample is the first one for which differences have been uncovered among religious groups. Differences accord with intuition, with more

conservative white religious groups (Pentecostals and Baptists) being less tolerant than Catholics and "Other Protestants."

In yet another instance no difference was found, thus contradicting an hypothesis which specified direction. The failure to find black females less tolerant than males may result from an absence of the condition which others have suggested as producing the difference. Black females' less positive attitudes toward desegregation have been explained by others as being caused by fears that their pool of potential black boyfriends will be diminished in the face of competition from white females. Clearly for black females to have such fears it would be necessary that a potential for interracial dating exists. While such interaction may be a potential in the North (all but one of the studies bearing on this point use northern data), black-white dating remains very unlikely in the South, particularly in rural schools.

From among all of the variables used, interracial contact and cross-racial friendships were found to be the strongest correlates of racial tolerance. Thus while other characteristics such as age, grades, or father's occupation influence racial tolerance, personal interaction with students of the other race is more important. While racial tolerance seems to be generally increasing among Georgia's students, it is developing more rapidly among those who develop friendships or have school-related contacts across racial lines. However, since friendship and other contacts do not supplant the influence of other variables, we must conclude that a number of factors impact independently on the development of racial tolerance.

TABLE 1

QUESTIONS USED IN CONSTRUCTING
THE RACIAL ATTITUDE VARIABLE
WITH FACTOR LOADINGS AND MEANS

Questions	Factor Loadings	Means
1. It makes no difference to me if my teachers are of my race or a different one.	.663	1.94
2. Racial groups should sit at separate tables in the cafeteria.[a]	.667	2.05
3. Members of any race should be allowed to sit anywhere on school buses.	.620	1.70
4. There is no basic reason for feeling prejudiced against another race.	.527	2.36
5. Having members of other races on my school's athletic teams would result in more "dirty playing" and unsportsmanlike conduct.[a]	.585	2.24
6. I believe that a member of the other race could become a very close friend of mine.	.678	2.21
7. Regardless of what anyone else says, I believe that my race is superior and should be accepted as such.[a]	.449	3.10
8. I would be willing to sit next to a member of another race in class.	.712	2.05

[a]Responses to these questions were recoded so that they would be in the same direction as the other five questions.

TABLE 2

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR TYPES OF INTERRACIAL CONTACT

Classrooms	.682
School bus	.544
Athletics	.631
Cafeteria	.729
School dances and parties	.681
Musical activities	.670
School clubs and organizations	.743

TABLE 3

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR RACE AND SEGREGATION/DESEGREGATION

	Black	White	Total
Segregated	0.3	18.4	12.5
N =	620	1261	1881
Desegregated	7.7	-2.9	2.0
N =	1755	2056	3811

Interpretation: Segregated students were significantly more tolerant both in the total sample and the white subset. Segregated whites were significantly more tolerant than segregated blacks. Desegregated blacks were significantly more tolerant than desegregated whites.

TABLE 4

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR SEX, RACE
AND SEGREGATION/DESEGREGATION

	Female	(N)	Male	(N)
Desegregated				
Black	8.7	(928)	7.9	(807)
White	11.9	(985)	-16.5	(1071)
Total	10.4	(1913)	-6.0	(1878)
Segregated				
Black	4.3	(306)	-3.1	(309)
White	28.3	(655)	7.3	(602)
Total	20.7	(961)	3.8	(911)

Interpretation: Females were significantly more tolerant in the white subsamples and in the total sample in both segregated and desegregated schools.

TABLE 5

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES CONTROLLING FOR PERCEIVED FAMILY SOCIAL STATUS, RACE, AND SEGREGATION/DESEGREGATION

	Perceived Class			
	Upper	Middle	Working	Lower
Desegregated				
Black	-15.3 (80)	7.1 (737)	11.0 (770)	-2.5 (90)
White	-26.4 (95)	0.7 (1482)	-12.7 (432)	-12.3 (13)
Total	-21.3 (175)	2.8 (2219)	2.5 (1202)	-3.7 (103)
Segregated				
Black	-36.9 (22)	-0.3 (249)	-1.2 (301)	4.7 (24)
White	10.2 (58)	26.7 (939)	0.8 (242)	-38.3 (11)
Total	-2.8 (80)	21.1 (1188)	-0.3 (543)	-8.8 (35)

Interpretation: Students who perceive their families as being upper class are not significantly more tolerant.

TABLE 6

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES CONTROLLING FOR FATHER'S OCCUPATION, RACE, AND SEGREGATED/DESEGREGATED

	Occupation								
	Profes-sionals	Mana-gers	Cler-ical	Sales	Crafts-men	Opera-tives	Farmers	Laborers	Service
Desegregated									
Black	27.9 (39)	16.7 (51)	4.5 (30)	-16.5 (14)	11.6 (223)	4.9 (366)	a	7.1 (226)	8.4 (55)
White	12.4 (236)	7.1 (350)	12.8 (103)	7.7 (148)	-5.3 (409)	-21.8 (363)	-38.7 (76)	-8.7 (53)	-12.2 (44)
Total	14.6 (275)	8.3 (401)	10.9 (133)	5.6 (162)	0.6 (632)	-8.4 (729)	-36.0 (82)	4.1 (279)	-0.8 (99)
Segregated									
Black	0.4 (41)	2.1 (27)	a	a	-6.9 (84)	3.3 (108)	a	17.7 (42)	6.7 (30)
White	30.3 (140)	30.6 (377)	6.3 (31)	32.8 (118)	7.6 (196)	3.8 (216)	a	-8.4 (28)	10.2 (34)
Total	23.5 (181)	28.7 (404)	13.8 (40)	31.7 (122)	3.3 (280)	3.7 (324)	a	7.3 (70)	8.6 (64)

Interpretation: For segregated and desegregated schools, children of white collar parents are significantly more tolerant than other children in both the white subsets and in the total groups.

a--Insufficient number of cases.

TABLE 7

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR ESTIMATED GRADE AVERAGE,
RACE, AND SEGREGATED/DESEGREGATED

	Estimated Grade Average			
	A	B	C	D and F
Desegregated				
Black	4.0 (141)	11.6 (752)	6.6 (740)	-5.8 (102)
White	11.6 (257)	2.1 (1032)	-13.8 (702)	-28.7 (53)
Total	8.9 (398)	6.1 (1784)	-3.3 (1442)	-13.6 (155)
Segregated				
Black	-10.5 (46)	3.7 (274)	-3.3 (281)	29.8 (12)
White	32.5 (154)	22.6 (601)	8.9 (443)	5.5 (55)
Total	22.6 (200)	16.7 (875)	4.2 (724)	9.8 (67)

Interpretation: Students with better grades were significantly more tolerant than students who do poorly in the following groups: segregated whites, desegregated whites, and the total desegregated sample.

TABLE 8

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR URBAN/RURAL,
RACE, AND SEGREGATED/DESEGREGATED

	Urban	Rural
Desegregated		
Black	16.4 (723)	1.8 (1031)
White	13.4 (1020)	-18.9 (1036)
Total	14.6 (1743)	-8.6 (2067)
Segregated		
Black	-4.7 (464)	15.1 (156)
White	31.7 (650)	4.3 (611)
Total	16.6 (1114)	6.5 (767)

Interpretation: Except for blacks in segregated schools, urban students were significantly more tolerant than were rural pupils.

TABLE 9

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES CONTROLLING FOR RELIGION, RACE, AND SEGREGATED/DESEGREGATED

	Religion					
	Baptist	Methodist	AME/ Pentecostal[1]	Other Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Desegregated						
Black	7.1 (992)	22.3 (110)	20.4 (125)	11.0 (98)	35.1 (46)	-------
White	-10.5 (978)	-5.2 (248)	-24.2 (104)	16.2 (239)	17.0 (298)	26.8 (23)
Total	-1.6 (1970)	3.2 (358)	---------	14.7 (337)	19.5 (344)	-------
Segregated						
Black	4.1 (374)	8.8 (25)	-30.0 (24)	-7.4 (48)	27.1 (8)	-------
White	5.5 (610)	20.4 (140)	0.8 (14)	38.7 (261)	50.8 (110)	43.5 (23)
Total	4.9 (984)	18.6 (165)	--------	31.5 (309)	49.2 (118)	-------

Interpretation: Except among segregated blacks, Baptists are significantly less tolerant than Catholics and "other Protestants," i.e. the groups which tend to score highest on the tolerance scale.

[1]For blacks this column reports scores of members of the AME Church, for whites scores in this column are of members of various Pentecostal faiths.

TABLE 10

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR GRADE IN SCHOOL (AGE),
RACE, AND SEGREGATED/DESEGREGATED

	Grade		
	8th	10th	12th
Desegregated			
Black	-1.5 (700)	10.6 (559)	18.6 (465)
White	-14.2 (623)	1.0 (835)	5.4 (577)
Total	-7.5 (1323)	4.8 (1394)	11.3 (1042)
Segregated			
Black	6.0 (180)	-7.2 (246)	6.8 (185)
White	15.3 (504)	22.6 (439)	17.3 (304)
Total	12.9 (684)	11.9 (685)	13.3 (489)

Interpretation: No significant differences were found among the segregated students. Among desegregated students, 8th graders were significantly less tolerant than 12th graders for blacks, whites and the total set. In addition, for the total desegregated set, 8th and 10th graders had significantly different racial attitudes.

TABLE 11

MEAN RACIAL TOLERANCE SCORES
CONTROLLING FOR PROPORTION BLACK AND RACE

Proportion Black	Blacks	(N)	Whites	(N)
0	------		18.7	(1250)
8-20	9.7	(139)	-2.6	(732)
40-50	10.7	(477)	1.0	(624)
51-60	10.3	(289)	-16.5	(228)
61-70	-0.9	(339)	-1.5	(289)
71-80	8.6	(511)	-2.1	(183)
100	0.2	(625)	------	

Interpretation: There were no significant differences in black racial attitudes. Among whites, students in all-white schools were significantly more tolerant than any other group.

REFERENCES

ALLPORT, GORDON W. (1958) The nature of prejudice. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

ARMOR, DAVID J. (1972) "The evidence on busing." Public Interest 28 (Summer):90-125.

BARTEL, HELMUT W., NETTIE R. BARTEL and J. JEFFREY GRILL (1973) "A sociometric view of some integrated open classrooms." Journal of Social Issues 29:159-173.

BROPHY, I. N. (1945) "The luxury of anti-Negro prejudice." Public Opinion Quarterly 9 (Winter):456-466.

BULLOCK, CHARLES S. and HARRELL R. RODGERS (1974) "Coercion to compliance: Southern school districts and school desegregation guidelines." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, August 29-September 2.

CAMPBELL, ERNEST Q. (1958) "Some social psychological correlates of direction in attitude change." Social Forces 36 (May): 335-340.

CAMPBELL, JOHN D. and MARIAN R. YARROW (1958) "Personal and situational variables in adaptation to change." Journal of Social Issues 14:29-46.

CHESLER, MARK, SIMON WITTES, and NORMA RADIN (1968) "What happens when northern schools desegregate." American Education (June): 2-4.

CRISWELL, JOAN H. (1939) "Racial cleavage in Negro-White groups." Sociometry 1 (1937):81-89.

DENTLER, ROBERT A. and CONSTANCE ELKINS (1967) "Intergroup attitudes, academic performance, and racial composition." In R. A. Dentler, B. Mackler, and M. E. Warshauer (eds.), The urban r's. New York: Praeger:61-77.

DEUTSCH, MORTON and MARY EVANS COLLINS (1951) "Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment." Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

DWYER, ROBERT J. (1958) "A report on patterns of interaction in desegregated schools." Journal of Educational Sociology 31:253-256.

DYE, THOMAS R. (1968) "Urban school segregation: A comparative analysis." Urban Affairs Quarterly 4 (December):141-165.

EHRLICH, HOWARD J. (1973) The social psychology of prejudice. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

FIDDMONT, NORMAN and DANIEL U. LEVINE (1969) "Attitudes concerning civil rights and related matters held by black students in a big city." Urban Education 4 (July):125-155.

GEYER, FRANCES (1973) "A study of prejudice reducation." Sociological Focus 6 (Summer):23-41.

GORDON, LEONARD (1966) An acculturation analysis of Negro and White high school students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.

GOTTLIEB, DAVID and WARREN D. TEN HOUTEN (1965) "Racial composition and the social systems of three high schools." Journal of Marriage and the Family 27 (May):204-212.

GREENBERG, HERBERT M. (1961) "The development of an integration attitude scale." Journal of Social Psychology 54 (1961): 106-108.

JAHODA, M. and P. WEST (1951) "Race relations in public housing." Journal of Social Issues 7:132-139.

KOSLIN, SANDRA C., MARIANNE AMAREL, and NANCY AMES (1969) "A distance measure of racial attitudes in primary grade children: An exploratory study." Psychology in the Schools 6 (October): 382-385.

KOSLIN, SANDRA C., BERTRAM L. KOSLIN, and RICHARD PARGAMENT (n.d.) "Efficacy of school integration policies in reducing racial polarization" (mimeo.).

LOMBARDI, DONALD N. (1963) "Factors affecting changes in attitudes toward Negroes among high school students." Journal of Negro Education 32 (Spring):129-136.

MASTROIANNI, MIKE and JOE KHATENA (1972) "The attitudes of Black and White high school seniors toward integration." Sociology and Social Research 56 (January):221-227.

MATTHEWS, DONALD R. and JAMES W. PROTHRO (1964) "Stateways versus folkways: Critical factors in southern reactions to Brown v. Board of Education." In Gottfried Dietz (ed.), Essays on the American Constitution. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

_____ (1966) Negroes and the new southern politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

McWHIRT, RONALD A. (1967) The effects of desegregation on prejudice, academic aspiration and the self-concept of tenth grade students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.

NOEL, DONALD L. and ALPHONSO PINKNEY (1964) "Correlates of preju-

dice: Some racial differences and similarities." American Journal of Sociology 69 (May):609-622.

PETTIGREW, THOMAS F. (1971) Racially separate or together? New York: McGraw-Hill.

PORTER, JUDITH D. R. (1971) Black child-White child. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

PROVENZA, LUIS and BONNIE R. STRICKLAND (1965) "A study of prejudice in Negro and White college students." Journal of Social Psychology 67:273-281.

RADKE, MARIAN and JEAN SUTHERLAND (1949) "Children's concepts and attitudes about minority and majority American groups." Journal of Educational Psychology 40 (December):449-468.

ST. JOHN, NANCY H. (1964) "De facto segregation and interracial association in high school." Sociology of Education 37 (Summer):326-344.

_____ (1972) "Desegregation: Voluntary or mandatory." Integrated Education (January-February):7-16.

_____ (1975) School desegregation: Outcomes for children. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

SHAW, MARVIN E. (1973) "Changes in sociometric choice following integration of an elementary school." Journal of Social Issues 29 (4):143-157.

SILVERMAN, IRWIN and MARVIN E. SHAW (1973) "Effects of sudden mass school desegregation on interracial interaction and attitudes in one southern city." Journal of Social Issues 29(4):133-142.

SINGER, DOROTHY (1967) "The influence of intelligence and an interracial classroom on social attitudes." In R. A. Dentler, B. Mackler, and M. E. Warshauer (eds.), The urban r's. New York: Praeger:99-116.

STEPHEN, A. STEPHEN (1955) "Integration and sparse Negro populations." School and Society 81 (April):133-135.

STOUFFER, S. A., et al. (1949) Studies in social psychology in World War II, vol. I. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

TABACHNICK, B. ROBERT (1962) "Some correlates of prejudice toward Negroes in elementary age children." Journal of Genetic Psychology 100 (June):193-203.

TUMIN, MELVIN M. (1958) "Readiness and resistance to desegregation: A social portrait of the hard core." Social Forces 36 (March): 256-263.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1967) Racial isolation in the public schools, vol. I. Washington: Government Printing Office.

USEEM, ELIZABETH (1972) "Correlates of racial attitudes among white high school students." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April.

VANFOSSEN, BETH (1968) "Variables related to resistance to desegregation in the south." Social Forces 47 (September): 39-44.

WEBSTER, STATEN W. (1961) "The influence of interracial contact

on social acceptance in a newly integrated school." Journal of Educational Psychology 52 (June):292-296.

WILNER, DANIEL M., ROSABELLE P. WALKLEY, and STUART W. COOK (1955) Human relations in interracial housing: A study of the contact hypothesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

WORKS, E. (1961) "The prejudice-interaction hypothesis from the point of the Negro minority group." American Journal of Sociology 67 (July):47-52.

YOUNG, ROBERT K., WILLIAM M. BENSON, and WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN (1960) "Change in attitudes toward the Negro in a southern university." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 60:131-133.